

J. Paul Gignac, SBN 125676  
J. PAUL GIGNAC, ESQ., APC  
15 W. Carrillo Street, Suite 246  
Santa Barbara, California 93101  
Telephone: (805) 683-7400  
Facsimile: (805) 962-0722  
jpg@foleybezek.com

Bobby Saadian, SBN 250377  
WILSHIRE LAW FIRM  
3055 Wilshire Blvd., 12<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90010  
Telephone: (213) 381-9988  
Facsimile: (213) 381-9989

*Attorneys for Plaintiff  
and Proposed Class*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
**WESTERN DIVISION**

EDWARD FEINSTEIN, individually  
and on behalf of all others similarly  
situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

FOUR SEASONS HOTELS  
LIMITED, a Canadian corporation;  
and DOES 1 to 10, inclusive,

Defendants.

CASE NO.:

**CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT**

1. BREACH OF IMPLIED CONTRACT
2. NEGLIGENCE
3. VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA'S UNFAIR  
COMPETITION LAW CAL. BUS. &  
PROF. CODE § 17200 UNLAWFUL  
BUSINESS PRACTICES
4. VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA'S UNFAIR  
COMPETITION LAW CAL. BUS. &  
PROF. CODE § 17200 UNFAIR  
BUSINESS PRACTICES
5. VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA'S UNFAIR  
COMPETITION LAW CAL. BUS. &  
PROF. CODE § 17200  
FRAUDULENT/DECEPTIVE BUSINESS

## PRACTICES

6. NEGLIGENCE *PER SE*
7. BREACH OF COVENANT OF GOOD FAITH AND FAIR DEALING
8. VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA DATA BREACH ACT

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

Plaintiff Edward Feinstein (“Plaintiff”), individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, brings this action based upon personal knowledge as to himself and his own acts, and as to all other matters upon information and belief, based upon, *inter alia*, the investigations of his attorneys.

**NATURE OF THE ACTION**

1. As of March 2018, Four Seasons Hotels (“Defendant”) owned or managed 115 properties all over the world. Every day, hundreds of customers book hotel rooms with Defendant. Hundreds of thousands of customers every year book hotel rooms using the Sabre SynXis Central Reservations system, which facilitates the booking of hotel reservations made by consumers through hotels, online travel agencies, and similar booking services. Defendant utilizes the SynXis Central Reservations system (“CRS”). Consumers expect the highest quality of services when booking a hotel room with Defendant. What consumers did not expect is that during the period between August 10, 2016 and March 9, 2017, their personal information would be collected by an unauthorized third party. The data of customers that stayed at Defendant’s hotels was accessed due to a data breach.

2. Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of those similarly situated persons (hereafter “Class Members”), brings this Class Action to secure redress against Defendant for its reckless and negligent violation of customer privacy rights. Plaintiff and Class Members are customers who booked hotel reservations with Defendant, during the period of August 10, 2016 to March 9, 2017.

3. Plaintiff and Class Members suffered injury. The security breach compromised hotel customers' full name, credit and debit card account numbers, card expiration dates, card verification codes, emails, phone numbers, addresses, and other private identifiable information ("PII").

## THE PARTIES

7. Plaintiff brings this action on his own behalf and on behalf of all others similarly situated, namely all other individuals who have made a booking at any of Defendant's hotels during the period of August 10, 2016 to March 9, 2017.

8. Defendant Four Seasons Hotels Limited is a hospitality Canadian corporation, with its headquarters in Toronto, Ontario, Canada. Defendant conducts a large amount of its business in California, and the United States as a whole.

### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

9. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the state law claims asserted herein pursuant to the Class Action Fairness Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2), since some of the Class Members are citizens of a State different from the Defendant and, upon the original filing of this complaint, members of the putative Plaintiff class resided in states around the country; there are more than 100 putative class members; and the amount in controversy exceeds \$5 million.

10. The Court also has personal jurisdiction over the parties because, on information and belief, Defendant conducts a major part of its national operations with regular and continuous business activity in California, through a number of hotels and with an advertising budget not exceeded in other jurisdictions throughout the United States.

11. Venue is appropriate in this District because, among other things: (a) Plaintiff is a resident of this District and a citizen of this state; (b) Defendant directed its activities at residents in this District; and (c) many of the acts and omissions that give rise to this Action took place in this judicial District.

12. Venue is further appropriate in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391 because Defendant conducts a large amount of its business in this District, and because Defendant has substantial relationships in this District.

### **SUBSTANTIVE ALLEGATIONS**

#### ***A. The Four Seasons Data Breach***

13. Sabre operates the SynXis Central Reservations system, which facilitates the booking of hotel reservations made by individuals and companies. Sabre's CRS serves more than 36,000 properties with 2.4 hotels added to Sabre's

1 system every hour and with over 8 billion CRS shopping requests each month. *See*  
 2 Sabre Results, available at <http://www.sabrehospitality.com/>.

3 14. On June 6, 2017, Defendant stated that “Following an examination of  
 4 forensic evidence, Sabre confirmed to Four Seasons Hotels and Resorts on June 6,  
 5 2017 that an unauthorized party gained access to account credentials that permitted  
 6 unauthorized access to certain unencrypted payment card information, as well as  
 7 certain reservation information....” Notice of Data Breach attached hereto as  
 8 **Exhibit A.**

9 15. In addition to the eight-month period, the unauthorized third-parties  
 10 would have had access to booking information up to 60 days prior to the breach, as  
 11 the SynXis CRS only deletes reservation details 60 days after the hotel stay. *See*  
 12 June 29, 2017, Google Notice of Data Breach, attached hereto as **Exhibit B.**

13 ***B. Stolen Information Is Valuable to Hackers and Thieves***

14 16. It is well known, and the subject of many media reports, that payment  
 15 card data is highly coveted and a frequent target of hackers. Especially in the  
 16 technology industry, the issue of data security and threats thereto is well known.  
 17 Despite well-publicized litigation and frequent public announcements of data  
 18 breaches, Defendant opted to maintain an insufficient and inadequate system to  
 19 protect the personable identifiable information of Plaintiff and Class Members.

20 17. Legitimate organizations and criminal underground alike recognize  
 21 the value of PII. Otherwise, they would not aggressively seek or pay for it. As  
 22 previously seen in one of the world’s largest data breaches, hackers compromised  
 23 the card holder data of 40 million of Target’s customers. *See* “Target: 40 million  
 24 credit cards compromised,” CNN Money, Dec. 19, 2013, *available at*  
 25 <http://money.cnn.com/2013/12/18/news/companies/target-credit-card/>, attached  
 26 hereto as **Exhibit C.**

27 18. Credit or debit card information is highly valuable to hackers. Credit  
 28 and debit card information that is stolen from the point of sale are known as

1 “dumps.” See Krebs on Security April 16, 2016, Blog Post, *available at*  
 2 <https://krebsonsecurity.com/2016/04/all-about-fraud-how-crooks-get-the-cvv/>,  
 3 attached hereto as **Exhibit D**. Credit and debit card dumps can be sold in the  
 4 cybercrime underground for a retail value of about “\$20 apiece.” *Id.* This  
 5 information can also be used to clone a debit or credit card. *Id.*

6 ***C. The Data Breach Has and Will Result in Additional Identity Theft and***  
 7 ***Identity Fraud***

8 19. Defendant failed to implement and maintain reasonable security  
 9 procedures and practices appropriate to protect the PII of Plaintiff and the Class  
 10 Members.

11 20. The ramification of Defendant’s failure to keep Plaintiff’s and the  
 12 Class Members’ data secure is severe.

13 21. According to Javelin Strategy and Research, “one in every three people  
 14 who is notified of being a potential fraud victim becomes one . . . with 46% of  
 15 consumers who had cards breached becoming fraud victims that same year.”  
 16 “Someone Became an Identity Theft Victim Every 2 Seconds Last Year,” Fox  
 17 Business, Feb. 5, 2014 *available at* [http://www.foxbusiness.com/personal-](http://www.foxbusiness.com/personal-finance/2014/02/05/someone-became-identitytheft-victim-every-2-seconds-last-year.html)  
 18 [finance/2014/02/05/someone-became-identitytheft-victim-every-2-seconds-last-](http://www.foxbusiness.com/personal-finance/2014/02/05/someone-became-identitytheft-victim-every-2-seconds-last-year.html)  
 19 [year.html](http://www.foxbusiness.com/personal-finance/2014/02/05/someone-became-identitytheft-victim-every-2-seconds-last-year.html) attached hereto as **Exhibit E**.

20 22. It is incorrect to assume that reimbursing a consumer for a financial  
 21 loss due to fraud makes that individual whole again. On the contrary, after  
 22 conducting a study, the Department of Justice’s Bureau of Justice Statistics (“BJS”)  
 23 found that “among victims who had personal information used for fraudulent  
 24 purposes, 29% spent a month or more resolving problems.” See “Victims of  
 25 Identity Theft,” U.S. Department of Justice, Dec 2013, *available at*  
 26 <https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/vit12.pdf> attached hereto as **Exhibit F**. In  
 27 fact, the BJS reported, “resolving the problems caused by identity theft [could] take  
 28 more than a year for some victims.” *Id.* at 11.

***D. Annual Monetary Losses from Identity Theft are in the Billions of Dollars***

23. Javelin Strategy and Research reports that losses from identity theft reached \$21 billion in 2013. *See* 2013 Identity Fraud Report, attached hereto as **Exhibit G**. There may be a time lag between when harm occurs and when it is discovered, and also between when PII is stolen and when it is used. According to the U.S. Government Accountability Office (“GAO”), which conducted a study regarding data breaches:

[L]aw enforcement officials told us that in some cases, stolen data may be held for up to a year or more before being used to commit identity theft. Further, once stolen data have been sold or posted on the Web, fraudulent use of that information may continue for years. As a result, studies that attempt to measure the harm resulting from data breaches cannot necessarily rule out all future harm.

*See* GAO, Report to Congressional Requesters, at 33 (June 2007), *available* at <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d07737.pdf>, attached hereto as **Exhibit H**.

24. Plaintiff and the Class Members now face years of constant surveillance of their financial and personal records, monitoring, and loss of rights. The Class is incurring and will continue to incur such damages in addition to any fraudulent credit and debit card charges incurred by them and the resulting loss of use of their credit and access to funds, whether or not such charges are ultimately reimbursed by the credit card companies.

***E. Plaintiff and Class Members Suffered Damages***

25. The data breach was a direct and proximate result of Defendant’s failure to properly safeguard and protect Plaintiff’s and Class Members’ PII from unauthorized access, use, and disclosure, as required by various state and federal regulations, industry practices, and the common law. The data breach was also a result of Defendant’s failure to establish and implement appropriate administrative, technical, and physical safeguards to ensure the security and confidentiality of



1 Plaintiff's and Class Members' PII to protect against reasonably foreseeable threats  
2 to the security or integrity of such information.

3 26. Plaintiff's and Class Members' PII is private and sensitive in nature  
4 and was inadequately protected by Defendant. Defendant did not obtain Plaintiff's  
5 and Class Members' consent to disclose their PII, except to certain persons not  
6 relevant to this action, as required by applicable law and industry standards.

7 27. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's wrongful action and  
8 inaction and the resulting data breach, Plaintiff and the Class Members have been  
9 placed at an imminent, immediate, and continuing risk of harm from identity theft  
10 and identity fraud, requiring them to take the time and effort to mitigate the actual  
11 and potential impact of the subject data breach on their lives by, among other things,  
12 placing "freezes" and "alerts" with credit reporting agencies, contacting their  
13 financial institutions, closing or modifying financial accounts, and closely  
14 reviewing and monitoring their credit reports and accounts for unauthorized  
15 activity.

16 28. Defendant's wrongful actions and inaction directly and proximately  
17 caused the theft and dissemination into the public domain of Plaintiff's and the  
18 Class Members' PII, causing them to suffer, and continue to suffer, economic  
19 damages and other actual harm for which they are entitled to compensation,  
20 including:

- 21 a. Theft of their PII;
- 22 b. The imminent and certainly impending injury flowing from potential  
23 fraud and identity theft posed by their PII being placed in the hands of  
24 criminals and already misused via the sale of Plaintiff's and Class  
25 Members' information on the Internet black market;
- 26 c. The untimely and inadequate notification of the data breach;
- 27 d. The improper disclosure of their PII;
- 28 e. Loss of privacy;



- f. Ascertainable losses in the form of out-of-pocket expenses and the value of their time reasonably incurred to remedy or mitigate the effects of the data breach;
- g. Ascertainable losses in the form of deprivation of the value of their PII, for which there is a well-established national and international market;
- h. Overpayments to Defendant for bookings and purchases during the period of the subject data breach in that implied in the price paid for such booking by Plaintiff and the Class Members to Defendant was the promise that some amount of the booking charge would be applied to the costs of implementing reasonable and adequate safeguards and security measures that would protect customers' PII, which Defendant and its affiliates did not implement and, as a result, Plaintiff and Class Members did not receive what they paid for and were overcharged by Defendant; and
- i. Deprivation of rights they possess under the Unfair Competition Laws.

### CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

29. Plaintiff brings this action on his own behalf and pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure Rule 23(a), (b)(2), (b)(3), and (c)(4). Plaintiff intends to seek certification of a Nationwide Class and a California Class. The Nationwide class is initially defined as follows:

All persons residing in the United States who booked rooms at any of Defendant's hotels from the time period August 10, 2016 to March 9, 2017 (the "Nationwide Class").

The California Class is initially defined as follows:

All persons residing in California who booked rooms at any of Defendant's hotels from the time period August 10, 2016 to March 9, 2017 (the "California Class").

30. Excluded from each of the above Classes is Defendant, including any entity in which Defendant has a controlling interest, is a parent or subsidiary, or which is controlled by Defendant, as well as the officers, directors, affiliates, legal representatives, heirs, predecessors, successors, and assigns of Defendant. Also excluded are the judge and the court personnel in this case and any members of their immediate families. Plaintiff reserves the right to amend the Class definitions if discovery and further investigation reveal that the Classes should be expanded or otherwise modified.

31. *Numerosity.* Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(1). The members of the Classes are so numerous that the joinder of all members is impractical. While the exact number of Class Members is unknown to Plaintiff at this time, Defendant has acknowledged that customers' PII was stolen for a period of 8 months. The disposition of the claims of Class Members in a single action will provide substantial benefits to all parties and to the Court. The Class Members are readily identifiable from information and records in Defendant's possession, custody, or control, such as reservation receipts and confirmations.

32. *Commonality.* Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(2) and (b)(3). There are questions of law and fact common to the Classes, which predominate over any questions affecting only individual Class Members. These common questions of law and fact include, without limitation:

- a. Whether Defendant owed a duty of care to Plaintiff and Class Members with respect to the security of their personal information;
- b. Whether Defendant took reasonable steps and measures to safeguard Plaintiff's and Class Members' personal information;
- c. Whether Defendant violated California's Unfair Competition Law by failing to implement reasonable security procedures and practices;

- d. Whether Defendant violated common and statutory law by failing to promptly notify Class Members that their Private Identifiable Information had been compromised;
- e. Which security procedures and which data-breach notification procedure should Defendant be required to implement as part of any injunctive relief ordered by the Court;
- f. Whether Defendant has an implied contractual obligation to use reasonable security measures;
- g. Whether Defendant has complied with any implied contractual obligation to use reasonable security measures;
- h. Whether Defendant's acts and omissions described herein give rise to a claim of negligence;
- i. Whether Defendant knew or should have known of the security breach prior to its 2017 disclosure;
- j. Whether Defendant had a duty to promptly notify Plaintiff and Class Members that their personal information was, or potentially could be, compromised;
- k. What security measures, if any, must be implemented by Defendant to comply with its implied contractual obligations;
- l. The nature of the relief, including equitable relief, to which Plaintiff and the Class Members are entitled;
- m. Whether Defendant willfully and/or negligently violated the Fair Credit Reporting Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1681, *et seq.*; and
- n. Whether Plaintiff and the Class Members are entitled to damages, civil penalties, punitive damages, and/or injunctive relief.

33. *Typicality.* Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(3). Plaintiff's claims are typical of those of other Class Members because Plaintiff's PII, like that of every other Class Member, was misused and/or disclosed by Defendant.

34. *Adequacy of Representation.* Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(4). Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the members of the Classes. Plaintiff has retained competent counsel experienced in litigation of class actions, including consumer and data breach class actions, and Plaintiff intends to prosecute this action vigorously. Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of other members of the Classes and Plaintiff has the same non-conflicting interests as the other Class Members. Therefore, the interests of the Classes will be fairly and adequately represented by Plaintiff and his counsel.

35. *Superiority of Class Action.* Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(3). A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy since joinder of all the members of the Classes is impracticable. Furthermore, the adjudication of this controversy through a class action will avoid the possibility of inconsistent and potentially conflicting adjudication of the asserted claims. There will be no difficulty in the management of this action as a class action.

36. Damages for any individual class member are likely insufficient to justify the cost of individual litigation so that, in the absence of class treatment, Defendant's violations of law inflicting substantial damages in the aggregate would go un-remedied.

37. Class certification is also appropriate under Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a) and (b)(2), because Defendant has acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the Classes, so that final injunctive relief or corresponding declaratory relief is appropriate as to the Classes as a whole.

## **COUNT I**

### **Breach of Implied Contract**

(On Behalf of Plaintiff, the Nationwide Class and the California Class)

38. Plaintiff alleges and incorporates herein by reference each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 37, inclusive, of this Complaint as if

1 set forth fully herein.

2 39. Defendant solicited and invited Plaintiff and the members of the  
3 Classes to book hotel rooms in one of Defendant's hotels. Plaintiff and Class  
4 Members accepted Defendant's offers and booked hotel rooms at one of  
5 Defendant's hotels.

6 40. When Plaintiff and Class Members booked hotel rooms at one of  
7 Defendant's hotels, they provided their Private Identifiable Information. In so  
8 doing, Plaintiff and Class Members entered into implied contracts with Defendant  
9 pursuant to which Defendant agreed to safeguard and protect such information and  
10 to timely and accurately notify Plaintiff and Class Members if their data had been  
11 breached and compromised.

12 41. Each booking by Plaintiff and Class Members was made pursuant to  
13 the mutually agreed-upon implied contract with Defendant under which Defendant  
14 agreed to safeguard and protect Plaintiff's and Class Members' PII and to timely  
15 and accurately notify them if such information was compromised or stolen.

16 42. Plaintiff and Class Members would not have provided and entrusted  
17 their PII to Defendant in the absence of the implied contract.

18 43. Plaintiff and Class Members fully performed their obligations under  
19 the implied contracts with Defendant.

20 44. Defendant breached the implied contracts which it made with Plaintiff  
21 and Class Members by failing to safeguard and protect the PII of Plaintiff and Class  
22 Members and by failing to provide timely and accurate notice to them that their PII  
23 was compromised as a result of the data breach.

24 45. Plaintiff and Class Members have lost the benefit of the bargain by  
25 having their PII compromised. Plaintiff and Class Members have spent more on  
26 booking Defendant's rooms than they would have if they had known that Defendant  
27 was not providing the reasonable security that Plaintiff and Class Members  
28 expected. Plaintiff and Class Members have lost money and/or property as a result

1 of Defendant's actions.

2 46. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's breaches of the implied  
3 contracts between Defendant and Plaintiff and Class Members, Plaintiff and Class  
4 Members sustained actual losses and damages in an amount according to proof at  
5 trial but in excess of the minimum jurisdictional requirement of this Court.

6 **COUNT II**

7 **Negligence**

8 (On Behalf of Plaintiff, the Nationwide Class and the California Class)

9 47. Plaintiff alleges and incorporates herein by reference, each and every  
10 allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 37, inclusive, of this Complaint as if  
11 set forth fully herein.

12 48. Upon accepting Plaintiff's and Class Members' PII in its point-of-sale  
13 system, Defendant undertook and owed a duty to Plaintiff and Class Members to  
14 exercise reasonable care to secure and safeguard that information from being  
15 compromised, lost, stolen, misused, and or/disclosed to unauthorized parties and to  
16 utilize commercially reasonable methods to do so. This duty included, among other  
17 things, designing, maintaining, and testing Defendant's security systems to ensure  
18 that Plaintiff's and the Class Members' PII was adequately secured and protected.

19 49. Defendant further had a duty to implement processes that would detect  
20 a breach of its security system in a timely manner.

21 50. A "special relationship" exists between Defendant and the Plaintiff  
22 and Class Members. Defendant entered into a "special relationship" with the  
23 Plaintiff and Class Members whose Personal Information was requested, collected,  
24 and received by Defendant. Defendant entered into a "special relationship" with all  
25 Plaintiffs and Class Members by placing their Personal Information in their  
26 database, and their affiliate's database. Furthermore, Defendant also created a  
27 "special relationship" with Plaintiff and Class Members who provided their  
28 information to Defendant and its affiliates, by playing a large role in creating and

1 maintaining centralized computer systems and data security practices that were used  
2 for storage of all of Defendant's customers' Personal Information. Finally,  
3 Defendant also created a "special relationship" with Plaintiff and Class Members  
4 whose Personal Information was placed in the Defendant database due to their  
5 dealings with its affiliates. Plaintiff's and Class Members' Personal Information  
6 was placed in the Defendant's and/or its affiliates' database so that they could  
7 receive access to hotel rooms with Defendant.

8 51. Due to Defendant's negligence, Plaintiff and Class Members have  
9 suffered a loss of value in the form of diminution in the value of their PII. The  
10 diminution in the value of Plaintiff and Class Members' PII results in physical  
11 damage to their property, namely, their PII.

12 52. Defendant had a duty to timely disclose to Plaintiff and Class Members  
13 that their PII had been or was reasonably believed to have been compromised.  
14 Timely disclosure was appropriate so that, among other things, Plaintiff and Class  
15 Members could take appropriate measures to avoid use of bank funds and monitor  
16 their account information and credit reports for fraudulent activity.

17 53. Defendant breached its duty to discover and to notify Plaintiff and  
18 Class Members of the unauthorized access by failing to discover the security breach  
19 within reasonable time and by failing to notify Plaintiff and Class Members of the  
20 breach until July of 2017. To date, Defendant still has not provided sufficient  
21 information to Plaintiff and Class Members regarding the extent and scope of the  
22 unauthorized access and continues to breach its disclosure obligations to Plaintiff  
23 and the Class Members.

24 54. Defendant also breached its duty to Plaintiff and Class Members to  
25 adequately protect and safeguard this information by knowingly disregarding  
26 standard information security principles, despite obvious risks, and by allowing  
27 unmonitored and unrestricted access to unsecured PII. Furthering its negligent  
28 practices, Defendant failed to provide adequate supervision and oversight of the PII,



1 in spite of the known risk and foreseeable likelihood of breach and misuse, which  
2 permitted a third party to gather Plaintiff's and Class Members' PII, misuse the PII,  
3 and intentionally disclose it to others without consent.

4 55. Through Defendant's acts and omissions as described in this  
5 Complaint, including Defendant's failure to provide adequate security and its  
6 failure to protect Plaintiff's and Class Members' PII from being foreseeably  
7 captured, accessed, disseminated, stolen, and misused, Defendant unlawfully  
8 breached its duty to exercise reasonable care to adequately protect and secure  
9 Plaintiff's and Class Members' PII during the time it was within Defendant's  
10 control.

11 56. Further, through its failure to timely discover and provide clear  
12 notification of the data breach to consumers, Defendant prevented Plaintiff and  
13 Class Members from taking meaningful, proactive steps to secure their PII.

14 57. Upon information and belief, Defendant improperly and inadequately  
15 safeguarded the PII of Plaintiff and Class Members and did so in a manner that  
16 deviated from standard industry rules, regulations, and practices at the time of the  
17 data breach.

18 58. Defendant's failure to take proper security measures to protect  
19 Plaintiff's and Class Members' sensitive PII, as described in this Complaint, created  
20 conditions conducive to a foreseeable, intentional criminal act, namely the  
21 unauthorized access of Plaintiff's and Class Members' PII.

22 59. Defendant's conduct was grossly negligent and departed from all  
23 reasonable standards of care, including, but not limited to: failing to adequately  
24 protect the PII; failing to conduct adequate regular security audits; and failing to  
25 provide adequate and appropriate supervision of persons having access to Plaintiff's  
26 and Class Members' PII.

27 60. Neither Plaintiff nor the other Class Members contributed to the data  
28 breach and subsequent misuse of their PII as described in this Complaint.

61. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's negligence, Plaintiff and Class Members sustained actual losses and damages in an amount according to proof at trial but in excess of the minimum jurisdictional requirement of this Court.

### **COUNT III**

#### **Violation of California's Unfair Competition Law Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 Unlawful Business Practices**

(On Behalf of Plaintiff and the California Class)

62. Plaintiff alleges and incorporates herein by reference, each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 37, inclusive, of this Complaint as if set forth fully herein.

63. Defendant has violated Cal. Bus. and Prof. Code §17200 et seq. by engaging in unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business acts and practices that constitute acts of "unfair competition" as defined in Cal. Bus. Prof. Code §17200. Defendant engaged in unlawful acts and practices with respect to its services by establishing the sub-standard security practices and procedures described herein; by soliciting and collecting Plaintiff's and Class Members' PII with knowledge that the information would not be adequately protected; and by gathering Plaintiff's and Class Members' PII in an unsecure electronic environment in violation of California's data breach statute, Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.81.5, which requires Defendant to take reasonable steps to safeguard the PII of Plaintiff and the Class Members. Defendant also violated Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. §45), and Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.81.

64. In addition, Defendant engaged in unlawful acts and practices with respect to its services by failing to discover and then disclose the data breach to Plaintiff and Class Members in a timely and accurate manner, contrary to the duties imposed by Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.82. To date, Defendant still has not provided sufficient information to Plaintiff and the Class Members.

65. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's unlawful acts and

practices, Plaintiff and the Class Members were injured and lost money or property, including but not limited to the loss of their legally protected interest in the confidentiality and privacy of their PII, and additional losses described above.

66. Plaintiff and the Class Members seek relief under Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, *et. seq.*, including, but not limited to, restitution to Plaintiff and Class Members of money or property that Defendant acquired from Plaintiff and the Class Members by means of its unlawful, and unfair business practices, declaratory relief, attorney's fees and costs (pursuant to Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 1021.5), and injunctive or other equitable relief.

#### **COUNT IV**

#### **Violation of California's Unfair Competition Law Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §17200 Unfair Business Practices**

(On Behalf of Plaintiff and the California Class)

67. Plaintiff alleges and incorporates herein by reference, each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 37, inclusive, of this Complaint as if set forth fully herein.

68. Defendant engaged in unfair acts and practices by soliciting and collecting Plaintiff's and Class Members' PII with knowledge that the information would not be adequately protected while Plaintiff's and the Class Members' PII would be processed in an unsecure electronic environment. These unfair acts and practices were immoral, unethical, oppressive, unscrupulous, unconscionable, and/or substantially injurious to Plaintiff and Class Members. They were likely to deceive the public into believing their PII was secure, when it was not. The harm these practices caused to Plaintiff and Class Members outweighed their utility, if any.

69. Defendant engaged in unfair acts and practices with respect to the provision of its services by failing to enact adequate privacy and security measures to protect Plaintiff's and Class Members' PII from further unauthorized disclosure,

1 release, data breaches, and theft and by failing to timely discover and give notice of  
2 the data breach. These unfair acts and practices were immoral, unethical,  
3 oppressive, unscrupulous, unconscionable, and/or substantially injurious to  
4 Plaintiff and Class Members. They were likely to deceive the public into believing  
5 their Private Identifiable Information was secure, when it was not. The harm these  
6 practices caused to Plaintiff and the Class Members outweighed their utility, if any.

7 70. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's unfair practices and  
8 acts, Plaintiff and the Class Members were injured and lost money or property,  
9 including but not limited to the loss of their legally protected interest in the  
10 confidentiality and privacy of their PII, and additional losses described above.

11 71. Plaintiff and the Class Members seek relief under Cal. Bus. & Prof.  
12 Code § 17200, *et. seq.*, including, but not limited to, restitution to Plaintiff and Class  
13 Members of money or property that Defendant acquired from Plaintiff and the Class  
14 Members by means of its unfair business practices, declaratory relief, attorney's  
15 fees and costs (pursuant to Cal. Code Civ. Proc. §1021.5), and injunctive or other  
16 equitable relief.

## 17 **COUNT V**

### 18 **Violation of California's Unfair Competition Law Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code** 19 **§17200 Fraudulent/Deceptive Business Practices**

20 (On Behalf of Plaintiff and the California Class)

21 72. Plaintiff alleges and incorporates herein by reference, each and every  
22 allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 37, inclusive, of this Complaint as if  
23 set forth fully herein.

24 73. Defendant engaged in fraudulent and deceptive acts and practices by  
25 omitting, suppressing, and concealing the material fact of the inadequacy of the  
26 privacy and security protections for Plaintiff's and Class Members' PII. When  
27 Plaintiff and Class Members were booking hotel rooms with Defendant, Defendant  
28 failed to disclose to Plaintiff and Class Members that its data security systems failed

1 to meet legal and industry standards for the protection of their Private Identifiable  
2 Information. Plaintiff and the Class Members would not have booked a hotel room  
3 with Defendant if they had known about its substandard data security practices.  
4 These nondisclosures were likely to deceive members of the public, including  
5 Plaintiff and Class Members, into believing their PII was secure, when it was not,  
6 and that Defendant was complying with relevant law and industry standards, when  
7 it was not.

8 74. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's deceptive practices  
9 and acts, Plaintiff and the Class Members were injured and lost money or property,  
10 including but not limited to the loss of their legally protected interest in the  
11 confidentiality and privacy of their PII, and additional losses described above.

12 75. Plaintiff and the Class Members seek relief under Cal. Bus. & Prof.  
13 Code § 17200, *et. seq.*, including, but not limited to, restitution to the Plaintiff and  
14 Class Members of money or property that Defendant acquired from Plaintiff and  
15 the Class Members by means of its fraudulent and deceptive business practices,  
16 declaratory relief, attorney's fees and costs (pursuant to Cal. Code Civ. Proc.  
17 §1021.5), and injunctive or other equitable relief.

## 18 **COUNT VI**

### 19 **Negligence *Per Se***

20 (On Behalf of Plaintiff and the California Class)

21 76. Plaintiff alleges and incorporates herein by reference, each and every  
22 allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 37, inclusive, of this Complaint as if  
23 set forth fully herein.

24 77. Pursuant to the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. §45),  
25 Defendant had a duty to provide fair and adequate computer systems and data  
26 security practices to safeguard Plaintiff's and the Class Members' PII.

27 78. Defendant had a duty to Plaintiff and the Class Members to implement  
28 and maintain reasonable security procedures and practices to safeguard Plaintiff's

1 and Class Members' PII as required by California Civil Code §1798.81.5.

2 79. Defendant breached its duties to Plaintiff and the Class Members under  
3 the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. § 45) and California Civil Code  
4 §1798.81.5 by failing to provide fair, reasonable, or adequate computer systems and  
5 data security practices to safeguard Plaintiff's and the Class Members' PII.

6 80. Defendant's failure to comply with applicable laws and regulations  
7 constitutes negligence *per se*.

8 81. But for Defendant's negligence *per se*, Plaintiff and the Class  
9 Members would not have been injured.

10 82. The injury and harm suffered by Plaintiff and the Class Members was  
11 the reasonably foreseeable result of Defendant's negligence *per se*.

12 83. Defendant knew or should have known that its negligence *per se* would  
13 cause Plaintiff and the Class Members to experience the foreseeable harms  
14 associated with the exposure of their PII.

15 84. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's negligence *per se*,  
16 Plaintiff and Class Members have suffered injury and are entitled to damages in an  
17 amount to be proven at trial but in excess of the minimum jurisdictional requirement  
18 of this Court.

## 19 **COUNT VII**

### 20 **Breach of the Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing**

21 (On Behalf of Plaintiff, the Nationwide Class and the California Class)

22 85. Plaintiff alleges and incorporates herein by reference, each and every  
23 allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 37, inclusive, of this Complaint as if  
24 set forth fully herein.

25 86. The law implies a covenant of good faith and fair dealing in every  
26 contract.

27 87. Plaintiff and Class Members contracted with Defendant by accepting  
28 Defendant's offers and paying for the booking of hotel room(s).

1 88. Plaintiff and Class Members performed all of their duties under their  
2 agreements with Defendant.

3 89. All of the conditions required for Defendant's performance under the  
4 contract have occurred.

5 90. Defendant did not provide and/or unfairly interfered with and/or  
6 frustrated the right of Plaintiff and the Class Members to receive the full benefits  
7 under their agreements.

8 91. Defendant breached the covenant of good faith and fair dealing  
9 implied in its contracts with Plaintiff and the Class Members by failing to use and  
10 provide reasonable and industry-leading security practices to safeguard the PII of  
11 Plaintiff and the Class Members.

12 92. Plaintiff and the Class Members were damaged by Defendant's breach  
13 in that they paid for, but never received, the valuable security protections to which  
14 they were entitled.

15 93. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's breach of the covenant  
16 of good faith and fair dealing, Plaintiff and Class Members have suffered injury and  
17 are entitled to damages in an amount to be proven at trial but in excess of the  
18 minimum jurisdictional requirement of this Court.

### 19 **COUNT VIII**

#### 20 **Violation of California Data Breach Act**

21 (On Behalf of Plaintiff and the California Class)

22 94. Plaintiff alleges and incorporates herein by reference, each and every  
23 allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 37, inclusive, of this Complaint as if  
24 set forth fully herein.

25 95. Defendant was required, but failed, to take all reasonable steps to  
26 dispose, or arrange for the disposal, of records within its custody or control  
27 containing PII when the records were no longer to be retained, by shredding,  
28 erasing, or otherwise modifying the personal information in those records to make



1 it unreadable or undecipherable through any means.

2 96. Defendant's conduct, as alleged herein above, violated  
3 California, Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1798.80 *et. seq.*

4 97. Defendant was required, but failed, to implement and maintain  
5 reasonable security procedures and practices appropriate to the nature and scope of  
6 the information compromised in the data breach.

7 98. The data breach constituted a "breach of the security system" within  
8 the meaning of section 1798.82(g) of the California Civil Code.

9 99. The information compromised in the data breach constituted "personal  
10 information" within the meaning of section 1798.80(e) of the California Civil Code.

11 100. California Civil Code § 1798.80(e) requires disclosure of data  
12 breaches "in the most expedient time possible and without unreasonable delay...."

13 101. Defendant violated Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.80(e) by unreasonably  
14 delaying disclosure of the data breach to Plaintiff and other Class Members, whose  
15 PII was, or was reasonably believed to have been, acquired by an unauthorized  
16 person.

17 102. Upon information and belief, no law enforcement agency instructed  
18 Defendant that notification to Plaintiff and Class Members would impede a criminal  
19 investigation.

20 103. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's violation of Cal. Civ.  
21 Code § 1798.80, *et seq.*, Plaintiff and Class Members incurred economic damages,  
22 including expenses associated with monitoring their personal and financial  
23 information to prevent further fraud.

24 104. Plaintiff and the Class Members seek all remedies available under Cal.  
25 Civ. Code § 1798.84, including, but not limited to: (a) actual damages suffered by  
26 Class Members as alleged above; (b) statutory damages for Defendant's willful,  
27 intentional, and/or reckless violation of Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.83; (c) equitable  
28 relief; and (d) reasonable attorneys' fees and costs under Cal. Civ. Code

1 §1798.84(g).

2 105. In violating the California Data Breach Act, Defendant acted in a  
3 willful, wanton and malicious manner, in callous and conscious disregard for the  
4 rights and interests of Plaintiff and the Class Members, and with knowledge that  
5 its conduct would substantially annoy, vex and damage Plaintiff and the Class  
6 Members thereby entitling Plaintiff and the Class Members to recover punitive and  
7 exemplary damages against Defendant pursuant to California Civil Code section  
8 3294 in an amount according to proof at trial.

9 **II. PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

10 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of all Class Members,  
11 respectfully requests that the Court enter judgment in his favor and against  
12 Defendant as follows:

- 13 A. For an Order certifying the Nationwide Class and California Class as  
14 defined herein and appointing Plaintiff and his Counsel to represent  
15 the Nationwide Class and the California Class;
- 16 B. For equitable relief enjoining Defendant from engaging in the  
17 wrongful conduct complained of herein pertaining to the misuse and/or  
18 disclosure of Plaintiff's and Class Members' Private Identifiable  
19 Information, and from refusing to issue prompt, complete, and  
20 accurate disclosures to Plaintiff and Class Members;
- 21 C. For equitable relief compelling Defendant to utilize appropriate  
22 methods and policies with respect to consumer data collection, storage,  
23 and safety and to disclose with specificity to Class Members the type  
24 of PII compromised.
- 25 D. For restitution and disgorgement of the revenues wrongfully obtained  
26 as a result of Defendant's wrongful conduct;
- 27 E. For an award of actual damages and compensatory damages, in an  
28 amount to be determined at trial;

1 F. For punitive and exemplary damages;

2 G. For an award of costs of suit, litigation expenses and attorneys' fees,  
3 as allowable by law; and

4 G. For such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and  
5 proper.

6 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

7 Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, hereby  
8 demands a jury trial for all claims so triable.

9  
10 Dated: April 20, 2018

Respectfully Submitted,

11  
12  
13 /s/ Bobby Saadian  
14 Bobby Saadian  
15 J. Paul Gignac  
16 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28